UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO.   | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |  |
|---|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|--|
| 10/528,678  | 03/21/2005  | David A. Bell        | GB 020155           | 4638             |  |
| 24737 7590 01/16/2009 PHILIPS INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY & STANDARDS P.O. BOX 3001 PDIAPCLIFE MANOR NY 10510 |             |                      | EXAMINER            |                  |  |
|   |             |                      | PACHURA, REBECCA L  |                  |  |
| BRIARCLIFF MANOR, NY 10510  |             |                      | ART UNIT            | PAPER NUMBER     |  |
|   |             |                      | 2436                |                  |  |
|   |             |                      |                     |                  |  |
|   |             |                      | MAIL DATE           | DELIVERY MODE    |  |
|   |             |                      | 01/16/2009          | PAPER            |  |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

# Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

| Application No. | Applicant(s)   |  |
|-----------------|----------------|--|
| 10/528,678      | BELL, DAVID A. |  |
|                 |                |  |
| Examiner        | Art Unit       |  |

|   | Repecca L. Facilula  | 2430  |  |
|---|--|---|--|
| The MAILING DATE of this communication appe   | ars on the cover sheet with the o  | correspondence add  | ress                                     |
| THE REPLY FILED <u>13 January 2009</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS A  | PPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR  | R ALLOWANCE.  |  |
| 1.  The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following rapplication in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appe for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods:   | eplies: (1) an amendment, affidavi<br>al (with appeal fee) in compliance   | t, or other evidence, w<br>with 37 CFR 41.31; or          | hich places the (3) a Request            |
| a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing  | date of the final rejection.   |   |  |
| b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Adno event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (I MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f   | ter than SIX MONTHS from the mailing<br>b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE<br>).  | g date of the final rejection<br>FIRST REPLY WAS FII      | on.<br>LED WITHIN TWO                    |
| Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date of have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extremely an extra transfer of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL | ension and the corresponding amount of the corresponding a | of the fee. The appropria<br>nally set in the final Offic | ate extension fee<br>e action; or (2) as |
| 2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in compl   | iance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be  | filed within two months                                   | s of the date of                         |
| filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter<br>Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed wi<br>AMENDMENTS  | sion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to   | avoid dismissal of the                                    |  |
| 3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, b   |  |   | cause                                    |
| (a) They raise new issues that would require further cor  | •  | ΓE below);  |  |
| (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below  | **   |   |  |
| (c) They are not deemed to place the application in bett  | er form for appeal by materially rec   | ducing or simplifying ti                                  | ne issues for                            |
| appeal; and/or<br>(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a c  | orresponding number of finally reig  | acted claims  |  |
| NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).  | orresponding name or an inany reju   | otod oldiirioi  |  |
| 4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12  | 1. See attached Notice of Non-Co   | mpliant Amendment (                                       | PTOL-324).                               |
| 5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):   |  |   |  |
| 6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be alle   |  | timely filed amendmer                                     | nt canceling the                         |
| non-allowable claim(s).   | ,  | <b>,</b>  |  |
| 7. A For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prove The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:  |  | l be entered and an e                                     | xplanation of                            |
| Claim(s) allowed:   |  |   |  |
| Claim(s) objected to:   |  |   |  |
| Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-10,12 and 14-20</u> .   |  |   |  |
| Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:  AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE   |  |   |  |
| <ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but<br/>because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and<br/>was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).</li> </ol>   |  |   |  |
| 9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to or showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary  | vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea  | al and/or appellant fail:                                 | s to provide a                           |
| 10. $\square$ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation  | of the status of the claims after er   | ntry is below or attach                                   | ed.                                      |
| REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER   |  |   |  |
| <ul> <li>11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but See Continuation Sheet.</li> <li>12. Note the attached Information Displaying Statement(s)</li> </ul>  |  | condition for allowan                                     | ce because:                              |
| <ul><li>12. ☐ Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i>(s). (</li><li>13. ☐ Other:</li></ul>  | r i 0/30/00) raper ivo(s)  |   |  |
| /Nasser G Moazzami/   |  |   |  |
| Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2436  |  |   |  |
|   |  |   |  |

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:

The 35 U.S.C.112, 2nd paragarph rejection is withdrawn.

The claim objections are withdrawn.

The 35 U.S.C. 103(a) rejection is maintained because:

### Applicant argues:

Amended independent claim 1 further recites the limitations of "control means, operable by each candidate person, to control third party access to the stored personal data relating to the candidate person." The Final Office Action indicates these limitations are shown in Sheridan in col. 2, lines 45-52. Applicants respectfully disagree. In col. 2, lines 45-52, Sheridan simply teaches "access rights..., to a remotely stored image set." Nothing in Sheridan teaches controlling, by each candidate person, access to the stored personal data relating to the candidate person. The image acquisition device for capturing an image of a target person is not controlled by an access right in the present invention, but the personal data is controlled.

The Examiner respectfully submits:

That Sheridan is not attempting to control access to the image acquisition device but is in fact controlling access to the personal images stored at the remote terminal by selecting from among a plurality of possible access rights to generate a granted access right set which contains a set of access rights to a remotely stored image set (personal image data) (Sheridan column 2, lines 46-52 and Figure 2).

#### Applicant argues:

Amended independent claim 1 further recites the limitations of "A user device comprising an image acquisition device..., a search engine for matching the captured image of the target person to a candidate person image data item and retrieving the personal data relating thereto, wherein the search is limited to candidate person image data items that relate to further user devices that are in the same geographical area as the user device..." The Final Office Action indicates these limitations are shown in Platt in page 2, paragraph 0024. Applicants respectfully disagree. In this section Platt teaches that a user can provide a search query requesting images that relate to a specific geographical location or vicinity. Thus, in Platt a user inputs a location and receives images in that location. Nothing in Platt teaches that the search is limited to candidate person image data items that relate to further user devices that are in the same geographical area as the user device.

The Examiner respectfully submits:

That the examiner appreciates the clarification but, Wang2 does in fact distinguish other user devices in the same geographical area as the user device (Wang2 column 8, lines 25-34).

## Applicant argues:

The Final Office Action indicates these limitations are shown in Sheridan in col. 3, lines 42-50 and col. 9, lines 1-8. Applicants respectfully disagree. In col. 3, lines 42-50, Sheridan simply describes the term 'communication' e.g. as a transmission of a signal..., via various means including satellite. In col. 9, lines 1-8 Sheridan simply describes a Hub station 20 having means for communicating stored image set signal to an of a plurality of terminal 40A, 40B, 40C to 40N connected the hub 20. Nothing in Sheridan and in particular either of these cited sections teaches "wherein the means for accessing and the means for retrieving include a wireless communication device that is adapted to communicate with a plurality of further portable devices, the further portable devices together forming the remote database."

The Examiner respectfully submits:

That Sheridan teaches that remote means at least in another building and that the communication means includes non-wired links i.e. wireless as well as satellite (this device could be installed on a satellite phone which would make its geographical area much larger). Sheridan's terminals are all described as remote terminals (Sheridan column 2, lines 46-52).

#### Applicant argues:

With regard to the dependent claims 2-9, 12 and 16-20, these claims ultimately depend from one of the independent claims, which have been shown to be allowable in view of the cited references. Accordingly, claims 2-9, 12 and 16-20 are also allowable by virtue of their dependence from an allowable base claim.

The Examiner respectfully submits:

That because claims 2-9, 12, and 16-20 depend from rejected claims they are also rejected.

Therefore, based on the arguments above claims 1-10,12 and 14-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).